P.X. 1-92

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1891-2

191 .
(L R)

Later references.

File No. 215

Serial Nos.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part ~~B~~ for April 1921.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Lalshiu Narasadat & Ramchandra of Dewadi Taluk praying for reduction of Land Cess on the Act. Case stated by the Court of Chandrapur Division of the said District.

GL 24. 175 § 29. 4-21. From the Dy. Commr. Bhandara
20-21.

GL 24. Acknowledges the receipt of a file of Vernacular proceedings on the subject of the appeal mentioned in the margin.

GL Sd.

Precis of papers
connected with
the case of Mande
bele' Lakshmi-
naraia & Ramap
with regard to the
Enhancement of
Kandayam on
their wet land belo
the Mandibele' tank
in Devanhalli
Taluk during the
Survey jamabandi

Mandibele
Lakshminaraia
presented a petitio
to the Superintend
of Bangalore Dist
on the 25th July 1861
stating that the
tank in Mandibel
village breached
80 years ago, that
since then the
land below the
tank was lying
waste, that there

was no water for
the use of cattle
& in the village
that it would cost
Rs 1500 to make
proper repairs to
the tank so that
10 Khandayas of land
below it might be
brought under wet
cultivation and
that he would lay
out that amount
and make the
repairs in case
Government agreed
to give him 10 ~
Khandayas of wet
land below the
tank at the rate
of one Fanam per
Kolga.

The Division Supt.
of Bangalore then
issued an order
to the Amildar of
Devanhalli Taluk

No 139

on the 14th August
1861 asking him
to submit a report
as to the length of
time during which
the tank was out
of repair, as to the
amount of Kandayam
for which the land
below it was given
out for "kullu gaval",
as to what would
be the extent of
land available
for cultivation
below the tank,
as to whether it
would be profitable
to allow the dur khast-
dar to make the
repairs or to have
them made by
government, as to
the amount it
would require to
make the necessary
repairs and as
to what the ryots

who had taken
up land for
"Kullen gawal" would
say in the matter.
The Amildar
thereupon submitted a petition
~~the petition~~ together
with his Report on
the 2d July 1862,
stating that the
tank was out of
repair for the past
80 years that it
would cost Rs 1500
to ~~execute~~ Execute the repairs
to the tank, that
there would be 9½
Khandees of land
available for culti-
-vation below the
tank, that the
land below the
tank had been
given out to the
Ryots for "Kulli-
-gawal" for a
Kandayam of
Pagoda 2-2 fanam per annum,

5

that the ryots were
willing to take up
the land at the rate
of 4 Pagodas per
Khandee in case
Government under
-took to ~~execute~~ execute the
repairs: and that
the ryots said they
could not undertake
to make the repairs
and that they had
no objection what
-ever if the land
were given out to
the durkhastdar.
The Amildar further
stated in his Report
that the durkhast
-dar agreed to make
the repairs, to do as
much as was possible
by the end of that
year and do the
remaining when
-ever it was found

necessary, that he agreed to take up the land at the rate of Rs 5-13-4 per Khandee and pay the Kandayam regularly whether he cultivated the land or merely kept it wash and that he was willing, in case he cultivated sugar cane, betel-leaf &c in his land, to pay half the Kandayam ~~fixed for such crops~~ ^ according to usual rates.

Gadsden ?

The Amildar in submitting this Report gave his opinion that it was under the above circumstances profitable to allow the Durkhastdar to make the repairs and grant him

him the land,
instead of Govt
undertaking to
~~Make the Repairs~~
repair the tank.

The Divisional
Superintendent
Mr Cupidon issued
an order to the
Amildar on the
17th July 1862 stating
that if what was
stated in this (Mr's)
Report was true
and the ryots were
not willing to take
up the land on the
same terms as those
agreed to by the
durkhastdar the
land might be given
out to him for
Kandayam after
obtaining from
him a proper
muchalika.

No 144

On the 1st Septr

1862 the Aurkhast-dar executed a muchalika to the Amildar of Dam-halli stating that he would execute repairs to the tank at a cost of Rs 1500, that he would do as much as was possible by the end of that year and make further repairs whenever it was necessary, that he would pay regularly 19 pagodas kandayam for the 9½ khandees of land granted to him, that in case he took up also the "Parampoke" land in addition to the 9½ khandees of land, he would pay kandayam for it at the same rate, and that

Vide copy of muchalika

9

in case he cultivated sugar cane, betel leaf &c in that land. he would pay half of the Kandayam according to the usual rates. ~~fixed for such crops.~~

The Amk Mastoar Lakshminarasia was granted a Patta by the Devanhalli Taluk to the same effect on the 10th September 1862.

In the "Kammi jastin patti" and the "Nagadigal Thanik patti" of Mandibele village for the year Krodhana (1865) and Sreemukha (1873-74) respectively increase of Kandaya is Entered against the name of Lakshminarasia on account of his having cultivated sugar cane crop in his land.

In the month of July 1867 Dasanna & some other ryots of Mandibele village applied to the Amildar praying that as there was some more land below the Mandibele tank, besides the 9½ Khandees granted to Lakshminarasia, it might be granted to them at the rate of 7 annas per Kolga.

Lakshminarasia also applied that the same land might be granted to him. Finally, this land was granted to him at the same rate at which he had originally been granted 9½ Khandees of land, in accordance with the order issued by the Assistant Commr

No. 56 dated 9-9-67
vide Amildar's Report
No. 1018 dated 6-12-91

who said that according to the Muchalika originally executed by Lakshmi-narasia he was entitled to this land also at the former rate.

In the Nagadipal Ajamayshi patti of the year Prabhava (1867) mention is made of the extra land having been given out to this Lakshmi-narasia, at the rate of 0-4-8 per kolga.

In a statement shewing particulars relating to the wet lands given out for kandayam in the Devanhalli Taluk, that was prepared on the

30th March 1865, 9½ Khandees of wet-land are stated to have been given out to Lakshminarasia for a Kandayam of Rs 55-4-6 at the rate of 0-4-8 per Kolga, in accordance with the Bangalore divn. Supt's order No 144 of 1862; and it is further shewn in this statement that the Mandibele tank ~~was~~ is a private one. ~~Shettis Lagawadu~~ (constructed ~~or repaired at the Khandayadar's own expence~~).

In the statement prepared in June 1872, shewing particulars relating to the tanks out

of repair in the
Jodi and Kayen-
-gutta villages of
Devanhalli Taluk,
this Mandibele
tank is shewn as
"~~Sarvanta Lagavadi~~" a private tank;
and it is further
shewn therein that
the Estimated cost
of repairs that this
Lakshminarasia
who then required
to make was Rs 252
and that out of this he had
made repairs at
a cost of Rs 35.
Lakshminarasia
(appt) has produced
a Patti dated the 15th
April 1889 shewing
the amount of
repairs he made
to ~~the~~ the tank
on various occasions.
This Patti mentions
that the Amildar
of Devanhalli sent
to the District office
a "garib Patti" with

his Petn no 363 on
the 11th December
1865 shewing that
when the tank
was inspected by
the Amildar on the
6th December 1865
it was found that
repairs had been
made to the tank.
at a cost of Rs 1120;
the Patti also mentions
that the Amildar
sent a "jarib Patti"
with his "urjee" no 838
of 23d October 1872
to the Dist Office
stating that repairs
costing Rs 1500 had
been completed before
that date (23d Oct 1872).

The same Patti
mentions that
the Amildar subsequently
another "jarib Patti"
to the Dist Office in
1873 stating that
additional repairs
costing Rs 265 had
been made; that
another (jarib) Patti was

15

prepared in the "Marament" Dept.
shewing that when
inspection of the
tank was made
on the 9th June 1874
it was found that
(some more) repairs
Costing Rs 315 had
been made; and
that the Applt Lakshmi
narasia in addition
to these repairs
Continued making
annual "~~bespan~~ turfing"
& other repairs up
to the 15th April 1889.

In a Notice dated
the 30th July 1872
issued to Lakshmi
narasia from the
Devanhalli Taluk
Kutcherry he is directed
to make some repairs
to the tank; and it
is also mentioned
there that if he
failed to make
those repairs within
30 days from the

16

date of receipt of the notice, that portion of the kandayam in respect of which ("riyayat") concession had been shewn would also be recovered from him or the land would be given to others for kandayam.

The appellant Lakshmi narasia was paying the reduced kandayam of 19 pagodas for the 9½ khandees of wet land below the Mandibele tank until the survey settlement in 1886-87.

On the 31st May 1886 the Deputy Superintendent of Survey wrote to the Shirastadar of Devanhalli Taluk

asking him to send the Pattadar along with the original order issued by the Divn Supt of Bangalore in 1862. The Amildar accordingly sent the pattadar with some records to the Deputy Supt of Survey.

The Pattadar was examined by the settlement officer. Pattadar Lakshminarasia states that endorsements nos 1165 & 1166 dated 12-7-86 were issued to him and to his nephew Ramappa respectively from the survey Deptt stating that a remission of one fourth Kandayam would be granted to them.

vide survey Dy Supt's no. 1297 dy 20-6-86

vide his Petn dy 18-9-91 to the Survey Supt

On the 3d Sept

18

1888 the Superintendt
of survey wrote to the
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore stating
that the records he
had before him
in connection with
the case did not
enable him to
conclude that the
Mandibele tank
was "a private one"
and that therefore
remission of one
fourth kandayam
could not be allowed.

No 3138

In this letter
the Survey Supt
requested the Deputy
Commr to see if
there were records
to shew that the
tank was repaired
by Lakshminarasa
at his own expense.

He has further requested me by Comm^r to see if there are "garib Pattis", to see if the tank is mentioned in the Regis^r of the "~~Sarkarada~~ private ~~Lagusadu~~" tanks, and that any "mujare" remission is granted to him (Lakshminarasiah), and after satisfying himself on a reference to the records that the tank is "~~Sarkarada~~ a private one ~~Lagusadu~~" to write to him (Survey Supt.) about it-and also as to why two names appear as pattadars instead of one as in the original order issued by the D^r of Survey Supt.

20

The Deputy Commr
issued an order
to the Amildar on
20-9-88 asking
him to reply to all
the points referred
to in the Survey
Supts letter no 3138
above.

The Amildar
in his Report no
48 of 16-4-89
states that Lakshmi
narasia and his
nephew Ramappa
being Equal share
-holders both of
them are in Enjoy
-ment of the land
and with their
consent the Patta
also stands in the
names of both.

On the 14th
January 1891
Lakshminarasia
one of the applts
presents a Petition

to the Survey Supt.
stating that during
the settlement, the
Deputy Supt. Mr. Rutherford saw the records
relating to the case
and issued endorsts
nos. 1165 & 1166 dated
the 12th July 1886 to
himself and to his
nephew Ramappa
respectively stating
that a remission
of one fourth kandaya
would be granted,
that thereupon these
endorsements were
shewn to the Amildar
that the Amildar
then began to recover
only three fourths
assessment pending
final orders, that
the Amildar was
demand

payment of the
arrears of the
remaining one
fourth assessment
due since the date
of settlement.
The Amildar in
his Report no 382
dated 7-7-91 states
that as the land
was originally
granted to Pattada
Lakshminarasia
on "~~Rayakat~~ reduced Kandayam
no further "mugare"
(remission) was
granted.
The Dy Commr
forwarded this
Report to the Survey
Superintendent. 13-7-91
The Survey Supt
thereupon issued
to Lakshminarasia
an order on the
8th Sept 1891 no 125

stating that as it did not appear from the order that any inquiry was given with respect to that tank and as the amount spent could not also be ascertained and the land appeared to have been given out for Kandayam, the said tank would be removed from the list of "~~Government~~ private Tanks".

No. 107

The Deputy Commr. also issued an order to Lakshminarasia on the 12th Sept. 1891 stating that in accordance with the Survey Supts' letter, he should pay up all the arrears of Kandayam.

Appellant Lakshmi-narasia thereupon presented a petition to the Survey Supt. on the 18th September 1891 requesting him to peruse all the records connected with the case and pass orders allowing a remission of one fourth Kandayam.

The Survey Supt. in his letter to the Deputy Commr. of Bangalore dated the 9th October 1891 requested him (Dy. Commr.) to give his opinion as to whether the land was "Sworutu Lagavadu" and as to whether a remission of one fourth Kandayam should be allowed.

In the meantime ie on the 25th Sept. 1891 Lakshminarsia and Ramappa filed an appeal to this office to revise

25. 25

the orders of the
Survey Supt and
the Deputy Comms
Bangalore No 125
dated 8th Septr 1891
and 107 dated 12th
September 1891 respect-
-ively on the following
grounds:-

1 That both the
orders have been
passed without
giving the Petrs an
opportunity to shew
their
the orders in ~~his~~
possession as well
as those to be found
in the Govt records.

2 That the tank
in question was
constructed by the
Pet. at his own
cost according to
order No 144 dated
17th July 1862 (vide
also circular No 227
dated 31st March
1863).

3 That although
the Estimated
cost was only Rs 1500

the Petrs had to
spend from time
to time Rs 3000 for
the construction and
upkeep of the tank.

4 That in the survey
settlement the assessmt
which was originally
Rs 55-4-4 was enhanced
to Rs 199-7-0 and
that out of this Petrs
were ordered to pay
three fourths.

5. That the Enhance
-ment of Rs 144-3-4
at the survey Revision
is prejudicial to the
rights of the Petrs.

6 That a demand
is now made even
of the one fourth
which was to be
remitted.

On the 1st November
1891 Lakshminarsia
(applt) presented a
petition to the Deputy
Commr of Bangalore
requesting him

27 27

to issue orders to
the Amildar not
to attach and sell
his land until
his appeal to
Government was
disposed of.

The Deputy
Commr issued an
order to the Amildar
on the 21st November
1891 asking him
to send all the
records connected
with the case.

The Amildar
of Devanhalli
the enquiry Submd his
Report no 1018 dated
6-12-91. The Amildar
in submitting this
Report states that
from the original
patta granted to
Lakshminarasia
by the Taluk Authority

no. 786

the land appears to have been given out to him on "nellu kandayam". The Amildar further states that when he inspects the tank he was of opinion that the tank had formerly been fully repaired.

vide his report 20/10/92 dt 6-12-91

Another order no 1121 dated 10th Feby 1892 was issued to the Amr asking him to report clearly as to whether or not the Pet: Lakshminarsia made repairs to the tank according to the order that had been issued.

no 1121

The Amildar in his Report no 1419 dated the 29th Feby 1892 states that since the former Amildar has made a "shara" in the "Jakhta" (Statt:) stating that the Pet: Lakshmi-

vide statement dated 22-10-72

29

Narasi[illegible] has in accordance with the Amuchalika executed by him completed repairs at a cost of Rs 1500, and since it was also found during the last inspection that Lakshminarasia had completed the repairs to the tank, there is therefore sufficient proof of his having made repairs at the estimated cost.

On the 9th March 1892 Petitioner Lakshminarasia presented a petition to the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore stating that the Amildar demanded payment of interest Rs 35-0-0, that he (Petr) paid under

protest the full
assessment fixed
by the Survey Dept.
and that the
Amildar might
therefore be directed
to postpone the demand
of interest pending
the decision of his
case before the
Government.

B.C.H.

Y
2/7/92

2/7/92
Y

2

Submitted to the Council.

2/7/92

24/10/92

Sub 7.3.93

21

Revenue appeal
No 106 of 1891

Appellants:

Mandibele Lakshm
-narasia & Ramappa

Memo:

In 1862 Mandibele Lakshminarasu applied for the gran of 10 khandees of land below Mandibele tank for cultivation. The land applied for was held by the ryots on "Hullu-gaval" tenure as the tank was in a state of disrepair. The petitioner offered to repair the tank at his own Expence to the Extent of Rs 1500. When the ryots were asked in the matter, they stated that if Government

were to repair the tank they would take up the land at the rate of 4 pagodas per khandie but they did not agree to repair the tank and take up the land.

Upon the recommend-ation of the Amildar 9½ khandies of land was granted to Lakshminarasia at 2 pagodas per khandie on condition of his repairing the tank. A muchalika was taken from him in September 1862.

From the list dated the 15th April 1889, produced by Lakshmi narasia, repairs to the extent of Rs 1120 were found to have been executed to the tank up to year 1865. The Amildar appears to have

(with this statement prepared in the Taluk by 22.10.72)

submitted a report in 1872 certifying that the repairs had been carried out fully to the extent of Rs 1500.

Petitioner Lakshmi-narasia went on paying Kandayam as agreed upon.

In 1886-87 the survey settlement took place when the Deputy Supt of survey gave Endorse-ment to Lakshmi-narasia and his Shareholder Ramia that one fourth remission of Kandayam according to survey rates would be granted. But no such remission was actually given. Thereupon Petitioner moved the Survey Department who after corresponding with the Deputy-

3/4

Commissioner's order on the 8th September 1891 ~~stating~~ that as the order granting the land contained no mention of any concession sheen and of the items of expenditure, but shewed that the land had been given out for Kandayan, the tank had been struck off the list of tanks maintained at private cost.

The petitioners now appeal against the above order:-

They contend:

1 That the tank in question was constructed by 1st petitioner at his own cost in accordance with order no 144 of 17th July 1862 issued by the Supt Bangalore Division.

2 That petitioners were enjoying the land paying only Rs 55-4-0 up to the date of survey settlement when the lands were assessed at Rs 199-7-0

3 That the terms under which the petitioners had to enjoy the lands were embodied in the patta granted to and the muchalika taken from Lakshmi-narasia

4. That the Enhance-ment of assessment at the survey settle-ment is prejudicial to the rights of Petrs

5. At the ~~settlement~~ settlement the petitioners were led to believe that in

the grant of the land in question for Kandayam as proposed by the Durkhastdar. But the Tahsildar's ~~report~~ report to which this was a reply shews that the ryots were prepared to pay assessment at 4 pagodas per Khandy if the tank were restored by Govt., and that the lands were recommended to be granted at 2 pagodas per Khandy subject to the restoration of the tank at the cost of the first petitioner.

The tank was in existence before though in a state of disrepair. The 1st petitioner appears to have restored it at his own cost to the extent of more

to the 1st Petitioner?

(2) whether pet. Lakshminarasia constructed or restored the tank at his own cost? If so, to what extent?

(3) whether the petitioners are entitled to any, ~~concession~~ and if so to what concession?

As regards the first point there are:

1 Div. Supt's order no. 1146 of 17-7-62.

2 Muchalika given by Pet. Lakshminarasia in Sept. 1862.

3 Patta granted to him in Sept. 1862.

The Division Supt's order authorizing

x

The original muchalika appears to have been sent to the District office in 1872 by the Amildar. It has been called for.

x

original patta is also called for.

The original muchalika is put up & the original Patta is produced.

~~The original patta is produced by the Advocate~~

the Revision of
Rodagi mans
a fourth would
be confirmed as
Inam.
6 Mal-a demand
is now made even
of the one fourth
which was to be
remitted.
The petitioners
pray that under
the terms of the
patta originally
granted half the
Survey/assessment
may be collected
in satisfaction
of all Govt demands

The points in
dispute are:-
(1) What are the
terms under
which the land
in question was
originally granted

39

Rs. 1500.

× ×

The original parcels pattis submd by the Tahsildar with Dist. Office in 1865 & 1872 have not been sent up. They have also been called for.

2/7/92

From the remark col(5) of the Copy added in the statement submitted by the Tahsildar in 1872, Vepuri Lakshmi narrappa appears to have repaired the tank in accordance with the original estimate of Rs. 1500/-. The Kodi is stated to have breached in 1871-72 & the Petitioner to have executed further repairs.

In the Copy of the statement submitted in 1863 Rs 1120 is stated to have been spent on the tank.

× ×

The original "parcels pattis" are not forthcoming.

RDO
17/10/92

Then what is the ground & Reason why Govt should spend money again & repair the Tank.

The Dy Com. in his report No. 206 of 27th May 1892 stated that the ground alleged by the Petitioner does not appear

Wrong order 3/8/93

What is the Extent of Cultivation under the Tank?

What is the annual Revenue under the Tank?

What is the annual Revenue under the Tank?

Libro Stampato by/ Record
di Kath Mc Cann/ Prezzo
Relegato in "Shedigo"
Riconsegnato in Con-
-segnato a/Mr Valentin
Mr Cook tenuto conto
Libro by Peter.

VL
24/10/92

41

Brun.

Le Prince de Caraman
Chimay est arrivé
à Paris avec
sa femme et
ses enfants.
Il a été reçu
à la gare par
le Duc de Rivoli
et par le Duc
de Mouchy
qui l'ont
accompagné
à l'hôtel
de Caraman
rue de Varenne
où il a été
salué par
une salve
de 21 coups
de canon.

Paris - Hôtel
Javel-Haut
for the night, but
the evidence of
fellow-travellers
the many accounts
Portrait à l'encre de
Chine

Le Prince de Caraman
Chimay, qui est
arrivé à Paris
avec sa femme
et ses enfants
a été reçu
à la gare
par le Duc
de Mouchy
qui l'ont
accompagné
à l'hôtel
de Caraman
rue de Varenne
où il a été
salué par
une salve
de 21 coups
de canon.

42

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
work [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]

3. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]

5. The foregoing orders were communicated to the Superintendent, Revenue Survey in Government P.s: No. 15320 (12) dated 16th P.Z. 1-92 March 1893.

6. In his letter No. 1930 (12) 18th April 1893, Colonel Grant states that under the circumstances now brought to notice, he has no hesitation in recommending the grant of remission of 1/4th assessment on the lands irrigated by the water of the tank in question.

7. If approved, the remission which accounts to Rs 46-1- may be granted with the usual condition that if the owners fail to keep the tank in good order and any of the lands under it now under cultivation are relinquished in consequence thereof, a Re

abandoned in to necessitate
their being sold for arrears
of revenue and bought in
by Government, the revision
now sanctioned will be
beneficial and the tenants
better undertake improvement
of Government.

Submitted for orders.

E.S.
6/5/93

9/5/93

14/5

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Lot 215/21.

Submitted.

Vernacular papers in connection with the Enhancement of Land revenue on inch lands belonging the Mandideoli Bank, i.e. the Dewan Bahadur Salubi, received as enclosures to the letters Nos. 256 & 297 dated 23rd May 1921 & 20th September 1921 respectively from the Dy Commr. of the — Bangalore District to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore were found in P.F. 1-92-93. When the files were taken for rearrangement by the Special Establishment.

There seems to be no use of retaining these papers in this office. The records may be returned to the Deputy Commr. of Bangalore.

A draft is submitted for approval.

19/4/21.

9.4.21

Issued No. C. 1974 3/ with Records

22.4.21.

N.B —Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

415 / No 136 R (2)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

Lr 215-91-1

The accompanying Petition No. 519 dated 25th Sept 91 received at the Dewan's Office from Bandikelly Lakshmi Narayya and Rangaiah residing at Devanhally,

is forwarded, together with its twelve enclosures, to the Dy. Comm. Bangalore Dist. for Examination & Report, & Return of Papers, together with a report.

By Order,

A1

for Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 7/11/1891.

16

Drafted as per Cr. dtd. 4/11/91

Petn in the file

Memo

Letter

General Serial No. 3[illegible]

OFFICE OF THE
2420
1892 29 MAY 92
P. 25
DEWAN OF MYSORE

From The Asst. Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Govern. of Mysore

Dated 27th May 1892
Despatched 27th Do
Received

Enclosures No. 2 files of
V. Papers

General No.
D No. 206

Reports on petition
from Lakshminarasayya
and another of Devanhally
praying for reduction of
Kandayam on their lands

Peter Branch
Asst
30/5/92

A1
31-5-92

D. C. No 206.
Encl. 2 Letters &
V. Papers.

The Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 1st Street.
Dated 27th May 1892

To

The Chief Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore.

Sir,

In returning the enclosures received with your Official Memo No. 136 dated 30th December 1891, I have the honor to state that in 1861 Lakshmanaiah, the petitioner, presented a petition to the late Mr. Meadows Taylor, Superintendent, that if the wet lands irrigated by the tank of Nandidroog village, Devanhally Taluk were given to him at a reduced rate of assessment viz: Rs. 0-4-8, per Acre, he would restore the Tank, which has been breached about 50 years ago.

2. The Mysore Superintendent

** Regarding petitioner Lakshmanaiah and matter of Devanhally praying for reduction of Assessment.

called for a report on the following points:-

(i) When was the tank breached?

(ii) What was the whole extent of the tank and what amount was then realized by Hulkeval or grazing.

(iii) What would be the cost of restoring the tank.

(iv) Was it advisable to give the land to the petitioner at the rate of Rs.10 per acre offered by him and whether the Ryots would take up the lands themselves at the rate offered by the petitioner.

3. The Amildar's report No:157 dated July 1862 stated as follows:- The tank in question was 150 yards in length. It was breached about 50 years ago. The whole extent under it was about 9 1/2 Candies. The extent together with the bed

of the tank intended by the Ryots on a Full Kanal Landayem of Rs. 6-6-0. They were willing to take up the land at Rs. 6-0-0 per Candy, if the tank was restored by the Government. The restoration was calculated to cost Rs. 1,500/. It was therefore recommended that the land might be given to Lakshminarsiah at Rs. 6-4-8 per Kadu, as he was willing to restore the tank himself and to pay half of the garden rate in case of his raising Sugarcane or other garden crops.

4. The Division Commissioner directed the Amildar in Turn No. 144 dated 17th July 1862, to make over the land to Lakshminarsiah if the Ryots were not willing to take up the same on the terms offered by former. The land was accordingly made over to him and Pottah issued in 1862-63.

The petitioner appealed the Court and enjoyed the land on half assessment up to the date of the Survey and Settlement. The Survey Superintendent after some correspondence on the subject disallowed the petitioner's claim on the ground that the records did not speak of reduced assessment but used the generic term Landagem and that no mention was made of any survey having been spent by the petitioner. Vide his Order dated 4th September 1891

5. The ground alleged by the Survey Superintendent does not appear to me to be supported by the records. The Order of the Commissioner dated 17th July 1862 when read by itself does not show that the word Landagem was used in a special sense, but the Auditor's report read in it

removes all doubt whether it was a "reduced" Sanadayen or not, it is certain that it was a Special Sanadayen and that it was conceded on the Consideration that the Sauk should be restored by the Petitioners. He appears to have restored it.

6. The Records are enclosed

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

Superintendent
pro Dy Commissioner.

WPH.

No.
1519
Regd

The Government of Bangalore
Bangalore

(Revenue Dept. Section No. [illegible])

Petitioners: Attached Ref. No. [illegible]

In Mandikeray Anikatim Kandaya and Hamala
Revenue Department, Bangalore Dated

That the letter dated the ordered to be
Secretariat and the Deputy Commissioner
order dated the [illegible]
dated the relative to
passed in the following manner:—

That both the orders were [illegible]
without giving the petitioner an opportunity
when the orders in the Government were
to be passed in the Government Secretariat

2. That the orders under reference may be
the Bank of Mandikeray village should be
removed from the list of Banks maintained
annually after.

3. That the Bank is entitled in accordance with
the 18th Section, and according
order No. dated 14th July 1862 (Code of Co
Circular No. 27 dated 31st March 1863 issued
issued to the same effect)

4. That before the cancellation of the Bank
in question was [illegible] and
and reports were submitted to the

That [illegible] the [illegible] should be remunerated

5. That the [illegible] proposed [illegible] than accepted by Government, and they were directed to construct the Bank in question.

6. That although the estimated cost was only £500, the Petitioners had to spend from time to time £3000 for the construction and upkeep of the Bank.

7. That the terms under which the Petitioners had taken over the Bank under the Agreement of the Bank were embodied in the Letter from the Petitioners on 8th October 852 and that a Memorandum had been taken from the Petitioners to the same effect.

8. That from and after the 8th day of October 1852 the Petitioners have been paying £2 Rent of Land on payment of £6 5s = £4.

9. That in the same Settlement the Settlement was renewed and was enhanced to £9 including the Rent of Land out of the amount the Petitioners were ordered to pay three fourths.

10. That the Petitioners submit that the Enhancement at the same Settlement is prejudicial to the rights and enjoyment of the Petitioners.

11. That the Petitioners further submit that the Order now under reference have the effect of debarring the Petitioners from enjoying the benefits accruing from improvements made at their own cost and direct violation of the Promises held out to the Petitioners in the Letter granted to them.

12. That after the [illegible] Settlement the Petitioners

were led to the [illegible] in the decision
of Madapilli vs [illegible] fourth issue of the
contested election.

2. That a demand if made upon the
respondent which would be the [illegible]
4. Other issues of the [illegible] from the
terms of the [illegible] may be struck out
During last the assessment [illegible]
of the income sworn may be received upon
the [illegible] in lieu of [illegible]

That the petitioner shall pay
Rupees [illegible]
25th [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Dr Mallikarjunayya

(Ruling in favour of the petitioner the
Court finds that the deposit may be directed
not to attach petitioner's belongings for the recovery
of the amount mentioned in his notice
herein produced.

[illegible]

Dr Mallikarjunayya

The Government of Tauranga

Claimants

Takamoana No 1 Block

Takamoana Survey

2 Tauranga

The list of documents produced by the Claimants along with their respective Petition:—

1. Plan granted to the 18th Takamoana Survey in the Township Block Tauranga dated 10th September 1862

2. Order (Hookham) given by the said Block Tauranga & Plan annexed thereto dated 18th Sept 1862

3. Order (Hookham) given by the Superintendent, Provincial Council, dated 8th September 1862 to the 18th Takamoana Survey

4. Notice addressed to the Petitioners by the Township Block Tauranga dated 10th July 1891.

5. Endorsement given to the 18th Takamoana Survey by the Survey Department dated 12th September 1891

6. Reading of the Petition of the Claimants (Takamoana) of the Block

7. Proof granted to the Executor of Mr. Farmer & Revocation of Col. Davis Admon
June 1862 (Copy)

8. Copy of the Instructions issued to Clerk
entering & Recording Copy - the 18th Feb. 1862
1.9.62

9. Copy of the Register showing the Caveats
entered by 11.12.65

10. Copy of the Register showing the replevin
(Proved & sealed 23.10.1872)
Bonds dated 23.10.1872.

11. Copy of the Writ written & the Proceedings
thereon entered & sealed by Mr. Farmer
dated 2/7/62 bearing No 157.

Total 11 (eleven documents)
Chg —

Principal Registrar
Probate Registry

Principal Registrar
25th October 1871

57

(General Serial No. 32.)

1892.3

No.	23
Name of Petitioner.	Kuttappa Hanumanthappa
Village.	Madibele
Taluk.	Devanhalli
District.	Bangalore
Date of Arzi.	14-7-92
Date of Receipt.	14-7-92
Date of Disposal.	
No. of Enclosures.	Nil

ABSTRACT.

Complains that his appeal in connection with a tank built at his own cost is kept undisposed of. States that the Dyftdr has kept up the record — Prays for early disposal.

S.Rp.

8/92 — Ref.

20/7/92

Reference Report that further information has been collected from the Dyftdr

22/7/92

Land Cases 8/92

5-8

DATE 23 R.
DATE 4-7-92

Petitioner
Date 23/7/92

23/7/92

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892.

From The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To The Deputy Commissioner Bangalore

Dated 2-7

Despatched 5-7

Received

To the Hon'ble

Enclosures No. Nil

General No. 73
Pet. No. 1-92

With reference to his D. No. 2060 dated the 27th May 1892, has the honor to request that he will be good enough to forward as early as possible the ~~respectfully noted~~ papers which are material to the disposal of Appeal No. 106 of 1891 - Appellants Mandibele Shanbog Lakshminarsia & another.

By order

Chief Secretary

(Draft)

(1) The original muchalika executed by Mandibele Lakshminarsia to Devanhalli Taluk Kutchery on the 15th Sept. 1862 which was sent to the District office by Devanhalli Amildar with his Lyee No. 1359 of 18-3-72.

(2) The Patta granted to said Lakshminarsia by Devanhalli Taluk on 10-9-1862

(3) "Jareeb Patti" sent to the Dist. Office by Devanhalli Amildar with his Lyee No. 8389 of 23-10-72

(4) "Jareeb Patti" sent to Dist. Office by Devanhalli Amildar with his Lyee No. 363 of 11-12-65.

KCA

60

(General Serial No. 32.)

1892.

No. 848 / 1892-93

Name of Petitioner. Court's Chowkey renewal

Village. Bidadi

Taluk. Ramanagaram

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 24 - 7 - 92

Date of Receipt. 10 - 10 - 92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

Submitted to the Council in Govt

BC Manager

ABSTRACT.

The Court of the Village was sanctioned by the Govt: the Petitioner in connection with his petn. for Chowkey renewal have been sent up by the Dy Comnr under date 27th June 1892. Coercive measures are addressed for the recovery of the Interest due on the Chowkey which he had withheld & subsequently paid; prays for early disposal of this case & orders for holding in abeyance the measures for the recovery of Interest.

Comptr. Sd/- 24/10/92.

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

MYSORE DEWAN'S
EDITION DEPARTMENT.
ACCESSION NO. 545 M
DATE 10-10-92

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892 – 3297 – 93.

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 20th September 1892.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No.
D No. 291

In reply to Cl: Dcey's docket of 1892
73
1-92 dated 5th July last.

~~SUBJECT~~

Submits correspondence
ending with Devanhulli
Taluk Amildar's report
dt: 123 dt/20th October 1892
containing the Original
Muchelika executed
by Mandicle Lakshmiarsiah in 1824.
Copy of Pattah granted to him
in the same year.

~~to be returned by Sub Dy Com~~

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

23/9/92

D. No. 297.
Enclosure

By Commissioners' Office
Bangalore District.
Dated 20th September/92

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 73/1-92 dated 5th July last calling for certain records, I have the honor to forward herewith the correspondence ending with the Devanhalli Taluk Amildar's report No. 123 dated 20th October 1875 containing the original Mouchilika executed by Mondiledi Lakshminarsiah in 1862 and copy of the Pattah granted to him in the same year.

2. The original Pattah granted to Lakshminarsiah is exported

x in connection with a similar petition last calling for certain records, vide 1519 from Amildar Lakshminarsayya and letter of Amildar

to have been given by him
to Advocate Gen Pentatranah
for being filed with the Appeal
Petition.

3. The Jareel Patta referred (copy)
to in para 3 of the docket under
reply, was with the records for-
-warded with this Appeal docket
No 206 of the 7th May last.

4. The Jareel Patta referred
to in para 4, could not be found.
Both the Nirannal and the
Revenue Registers of the Devanhalli
Taluk maintained in this Office,
in the year 1865 have been
Searched. The former has only
54 numbers registered in
December 1865, while in the latter
the number 363 treats of an
altogether different

Subject. 65

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant.

[illegible]

for Dy Commissioner

96

(12)

L.A. 9/5/91.

Read:—

(1) Petition No. 116 of 1891 from Municipal Council Ratnapura and 2 others of Divisional Appealing against the Order of Government, dated 21st September 1891, in respect of the assessment of certain lands held by, & the Municipal Council.

(2) Letter No. 1015 of 2nd May 1892 & No. 2277 of 30th September 1892 from the Govt. Agent Sabaragamuwa and the Memo. thereon.

No. 15320
Petn. — 92

Order thereon.

Dated 16th September 1892.

The Petitioners urge that, in consideration of their having restored the land, they all, under the terms upon which they undertook the work, entitled to hold the lands in question at reduced assessment. The Govt. Agent is of opinion that the Order of the Govt. Assembly on which the

the

the Lands were situated did not
warrant a Railroad Assessment
being fixed upon the Lands, and
ordered that Petitioners should
pay the Assessment fixed at the
Settlement. The Deputy Surv.
of Bayville, in forwarding
the Records, states that Petr.
Larrimi Mazzanini had entered
and, refused the Land, and
that the Rule of the Comm.
Land in the West Division
if increased, when that a
Special Assessment was fixed
as a Condition for the retention
of the Land.

2. If, as reported by the
Dy Comr, Larrimi Mazzanini
exercised refusing and, retained
the Land according to the
estimate at his own cost,
and spent a large sum, his
case is deserving of consideration.

3. The Survey Office does not
appear to have had all the
information now furnished,
before him when he passed the
Order of the 24th September on the
Report of the Dy Comr dated 2nd May
1892 and the Records received

therewith

67

will be
Warrant ~~to be issued~~ forwarded
to him, ~~and he is~~ with a
~~requested to~~ request to
~~sign the same and return~~ sign the same and return
Jamaica ~~to me~~ to me without delay
now brought to notice, he is
requested to, ~~cause the~~, recommend
the grant of any remission
of assessment to Petitioners

AM
15/3/95

Received
S.L.

16/3/95
Chief Secretary.

To—
The Survey Superintendent.

From.

The Chief Secretary
to the Board of Revenue

To. The Superintendent of
Revenue Survey

Esqr

Requesting him to state
whether, under the circumstances
now brought to notice, he is
disposed to recommend the
grant of any remission of
assessment to Mundidelle Nattam
Mullagaya and Ramaiya of
Devanhalli